

REMARKS

No claims have been added or amended. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-27 remain pending in this Application. Applicants thank the Examiner for participating in a telephone interview on October 19, 2007, during which the Lakritz reference (WO 01/69420) and pages 2-3 of the August 27, 2007 Office Action were discussed.

Agreement to Withdraw the Final Rejection

During the telephone interview, the Examiner clarified that page 2 of the Office Action (e.g., “*implies* determining the output language from a login . . .”) set forth a rejection based on inherency. Thereafter, it was agreed that the Lakritz reference does not inherently disclose “determining from a login by the front-end application that the textual information should be output in the first language,” as described in pending claim 1. In particular, this feature is not “necessarily present” in Lakritz’s disclosure. MPEP § 2112(IV). Accordingly, it was agreed that the Examiner would withdraw this final rejection.

The Examiner also clarified that page 3 of the Office Action (e.g., “*implies* receiving a back-end model output”) set forth a rejection based on inherency. Again, it was agreed that the Examiner would withdraw this final rejection because particular features (described below) recited in claims 10 and 17 are not “necessarily present” in Lakritz.

Applicants respectfully request a prompt withdrawal of the rejections based on Lakritz and a formal Notice of Allowance. As described in more detail below, independent claims 1, 10, and 17 describe subject matter that is patentable over Lakritz and all other references cited in the record. Furthermore, dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-27 are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claim and for the additional inventive features described therein. Thus, claims 1-3 and 5-27 are in condition for allowance after the final rejection is withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Lakritz reference fails to disclose each and every element of independent claim 1.

Unlike claim 1, Lakritz fails to disclose a method that includes “determining from a login by the front-end application that the textual information should be output in the first language.” Rather, Lakritz discloses the “Web site visitor’s language and country” are determined by a number of options (e.g., “language preference setting in the browser, cookie from previous visit to the Web site,” and others)—none of which disclose the claimed operation. (Lakritz at p. 6, lines 12-21). In particular, none of the options disclosed by Lakritz include determining the output language from a login by the same front-end application that requests execution of a task associated with a data mining model. Thus, the Lakritz reference does not anticipate, expressly or inherently, method claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over Lakritz and all other references cited in the record. Dependent claims 2-3 and 5-9 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 and for the additional inventive features described therein. Prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-16

Independent claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Lakritz reference fails to disclose each and every element of claim 10.

Unlike claim 10, Lakritz fails to disclose a method that includes “receiving a back-end model output from the back-end analytical engine, the back-end model output including information generated in response to the execution of the data mining model based upon the input data of the task request.” Rather, Lakritz discloses that a previously stored, static “document template” of a Web site is called upon to create “localized documents” in the form of web pages having a selected language. (Lakritz at p. 7, lines 17-19; p. 13, lines 20-22). Because Lakritz is lacking the back-end model output generated in response to the execution of the data mining model, Lakritz also fails to disclose “inserting the first entry from the contents of the extension document into the back-end model output to produce an updated model output.”

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 is patentable over Lakritz and all other references cited in the record. Dependent claims 11-16 are patentable for at least the

same reasons as independent claim 10 and for the additional inventive features described therein. Prompt allowance of claims 10-16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-27

Independent claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Lakritz reference fails to disclose each and every element of claim 17.

Unlike claim 17, Lakritz fails to describe a “request from the front-end application including input data that is employed by a back-end analytical engine to execute the data mining model to generate a back-end model output.” Rather, as previously described, Lakritz provides a localized translation of the web page based upon a static “document template.” (Lakritz at p. 7, lines 17-19; p. 13, lines 20-22.) Therefore, it follows that Lakritz also fails to disclose the claimed operation of, “in response to receiving the back-end model output from the back-end analytical engine, outputting to the front-end application an updated model output.”

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 17 is patentable over Lakritz and all other references cited in the record. Dependent claims 18-27 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 17 and for the additional inventive features described therein. Prompt allowance of claims 17-27 is respectfully requested.

Request for Reconsideration

Applicants submit that claims 1-3 and 5-27 are patentable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. The Examiner should infer no (i) adoption of a position with respect to patentability, (ii) change in the Applicants' position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the invention, or (iii) acquiescence in any way to any position taken by the Examiner, based on the amendments made herein.

Applicant : Achim Kraiss et al.
Serial No. : 10/664,771
Filed : September 17, 2003
Page : 5 of 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-109001 / 2003P00171 US01

No fee is believed to be due at this time. If necessary, please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 22, 2007



Michael T. Hawkins
Reg. No. 57,867

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696